

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 16 July 2004. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 9—11 have been amended to more clearly articulate, point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the subject invention.

The Examiner rejected Claims 9—11 in the outstanding Official Action of 16 July 2004 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being “replete with idiomatic and grammatical errors. These errors have all been corrected and the corrections incorporated in the currently amended Claims 9—11.

The Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 9—11 “appear to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph...” Insofar as the currently amended Claims 9—11 have been rewritten and amended to remove any errors of idiom and grammar, it is believed that the basis for the Examiner’s rejections has been overcome.

It is the Applicant’s belief that the subject Patent Application is now in condition for approval, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry L. Sernaker
Registration #50,595

Dated 10/7/04

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 456-6678